



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

097235,038 01/21/99 KRUY

S 777.240US1

TM02/1219
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

HO, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED:

12/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

[Signature]
1-File Copy

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/235,038

Applicant(s)

Krui et al.

Examiner

RUAY LIAN HO

Group Art Unit

2172



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 21, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Abbreviation 'SCC' is not clear. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The 'SCC' is not clear, a full terminology should be used with the abbreviation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2172

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by House et al. (USPN 6,145,119).

Regarding claim 1:

Each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed by House et al., note: the claimed 'a program to manipulate an item' is shown in col.2, l.4-8,
the claimed 'a database having the item' is shown in col.3, l.44-50,
the claimed 'a SCC system to store versions of the item' is shown in col.6, l.17-34 & col.7, l.52-67,
the claimed 'a mechanism to check in and check out the item' is shown in col.5, l.10-27.

Regarding claim 2:

The claimed 'an editor program to edit the stored program' is shown in col.5, l.10-27.

Regarding claim 3:

The claimed 'the program requests to check out the item such that the mechanism checks out the item to the program' is shown in col.4, l.32-49.

Regarding claim 4:

The claimed 'a choice of a version of the item at the SCC system and a version of the item at the database' is shown in col.6, l.17-34 & col.7, l.52-67.

Regarding claim 5:

Claim 5 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Regarding claim 6:

Art Unit: 2172

Claim 6 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Regarding claim 7:

Claim 7 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 8:

Claim 8 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 9:

The claimed 'the database comprises a Structured Query Language (SQL) database' is shown in col.5, l.10-27.

Regarding claim 10:

The claimed 'comparing a stream of the item in the SCC system with a stream of the item in a database' is shown in col.7, l.6-28.

Claim 10 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claims 11-14:

Claims 11-14 are rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 1-4.

Regarding claims 15-18:

Claims 15-18 are rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 10-14.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2172

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruay L. Ho whose telephone number is (703) 305-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051 or (703) 308-5403.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.



RUAY LIAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER